APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/587,171	06/02/2000	Michael L. Van De Vanter	A-69269/SFC/MAK	7355

22120   7590   12/04/2002

ZAGORIN O'BRIEN & GRAHAM LLP
401 W 15TH STREET
SUITE 870
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER
KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _6/2/.00_

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _02 June 2000_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _6_ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-12 have been examined.

Drawings

2.   The drawings are objected to because reference symbol "123" does not clearly point to the quote (") as indicated on page 21, line 31.

3.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: "125" in Fig. 5F.

4.   A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, and/or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Description of Fig. 5F is missing from the Brief Description of the Drawings section on page 14.

"32-" on page 16, line 26, should presumably read --320--.

"processers" on page 22, line 19, should read --processors--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6.   Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: a semicolon (;) is missing

at the end of step (b). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing

to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

invention.

The term "substantially transparent" in claim 5 is a relative term which renders the claim

indefinite. The term "substantially transparent" is not defined by the claim, the specification

does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the

art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The limitation "substantially

transparent to said programmer" is rendered indefinite by the use of this relative term.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10.   Claims 1-3 and 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 5,857,212 to Van De Vanter.

As per claim 1, Van De Vanter discloses such a method, along with such a computer

system (see Fig. 1), comprising: in realtime, examining each programmer input to identify an

entered character as an opening trigger token (a double quote is recognized as belonging to an

incomplete string literal; see column 27, lines 55-63); upon recognizing said trigger token,

creating a new sub-document for which there is displayed an opening boundary token and a

closing boundary token, said sub-document associated with at least one special property relevant

to said trigger token (a complete string literal object is created; see column 28, lines 58-66);

placing a cursor in a representation of said sub-document viewable on a monitor coupleable to

said computer system, said cursor appearing between said opening boundary token and said

closing boundary token (see column 28, lines 63-66); entering subsequent programmer input in a

view of said sub-document on said monitor (displayed by the typographical display processor;

see column 28, lines 58-63); and cursoring beyond a said boundary token to exit said sub-document and return to said outer document (see column 28, line 63 through column 29, line 2).

As per claim 2, Van De Vanter further discloses preventing the programmer from deleting a single said boundary token unless said sub-document is empty (see column 29, lines 2-4), wherein said deleting results in deletion of each said boundary token (thus, there are no unmatched string literals; see column 29, lines 4-6).

As per claim 3, see the rationale provided above for claim 2.

As per claim 5, Van De Vanter further discloses the step of exiting the sub-document being executed by the CPU (see column 28, line 63 through column 29, line 2 and column 8, lines 25-32).

As per claim 6-8, Van De Vanter further discloses the sub-editor applying different language rules, stylistic rules, and different commands for different languages used by the programmer (see column 29, lines 28-42; and column 29, line 58 through column 30, line 5).

As per claim 9, Van De Vanter further discloses upon detection of a manually input closing trigger token, moving said cursor beyond a boundary token and exiting said sub-document (see column 28, line 66 through column 29, line 2).

As per claims 10 and 11, Van De Vanter further discloses such a system and computer readable medium (secondary memory; see Fig. 1) for carrying out the aforementioned method steps (claim 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

12.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.

5,857,212 to Van De Vanter.

As per claim 4, Van De Vanter discloses preventing a user from deleting a boundary

token if the sub-document is not empty (see column 29, lines 2-4) but fails to expressly disclose

moving the cursor over the boundary token. However, Van De Vanter further teaches moving

the cursor over a boundary token (separator) when an attempted deletion the boundary token

would have resulted in an invalid result (see column 26, lines 31-50). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made

to modify the sub-document boundary token deletion prevention of Van De Vanter to include

moving the cursor over the boundary token. One would be motivated to do so to prevent an

improper joining of tokens.

13.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.

5,857,212 to Van De Vanter in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,140,521 to Kozol et al.

As per claim 12, Van De Vanter discloses such a computer system, including the editor

system and sub-editor system which places a cursor between an opening boundary token and a

closing boundary token (see disclosures applied above to claims 1 and 11) but fails to expressly

disclose the sub-editor system including at least one recursively embeddable sub-editor.

However, Kozol teaches a structured document incorporating boundary tokens (tags) defining

the boundaries of recursively embeddable sub-documents (see, for example, column 3, lines 48-

56 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the inter-boundary-token sub-editor

of Van De Vanter to include recursively embeddable sub-editors as per the teachings of Kozol.

One would be motivated to do so to have the ability to process boundary tokens for recursively

embeddable sub-documents.

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (703) 305-7737. The

examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:30 am - 5:00 pm. The examiner can also be

reached on alternate Mondays.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789.

> **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**
>   Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
>   Washington, DC 20231
> **Or faxed to:**
>   (703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)
> **Or:**
>   (703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label
>   "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")
> Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
> Drive, Arlington, VA, 22202, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

        Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

EBK/ebk
November 22, 2002

ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER